

- 5 -

REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on October 20, 1999. Claims 1-10 are standing for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunnicut (US 5,889,952) hereinafter Hunnicut, in view of Epstein (US 2002/0124176 A1) hereinafter Epstein. There is no specific rejection to claims 2-5 and 7-10 in the Examiner's Office Letter. There are, however, remarks provided by the Examiner which would lead applicant to the assumption that said claims are also rejected. For the sake of the present Response, applicant will assume that claims 2-5 and 7-10 are also rejected using the same references provided against claims 1 and 6 above.

The applicant has carefully noted and reviewed the Examiner's rejection, reference and comments. Applicant herein argues the patentability of the claims over the prior art provided by the Examiner, as the references clearly fail to support the 103 (a) rejection presented by the Examiner.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, the Examiner states that Hunnicut discloses that when a user "logs on" to an operating system the user supplies their user name and password. If the operating system recognizes the user, then a user token is generated by the system and added to a user-token cache. At subsequent "log-on" by the same user, the system returns the same user token from the user token cache (Hunnicut: col. 2, lines 25-30). The Examiner continues to state that this meets the limitation of "a password code (P-token) generator; and upon a log-in request signal to the IH from the PD, the IH opens a communication link to the network server, requests the P-token from the PD. However, the Examiner admits, Hunnicut does not disclose a location token generator.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's interpretation of Hunnicut, arguing that the tokens generated by Hunnicut are stored at the

- 6 -

server to match with user-provided log-on in order to allow access to requested files that have been previously/recently accessed by that user. In the art of Hunnicut the user always has to "log-on" with at least a user name.

Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to Fig. 5 of Hunnicut with the corresponding text in column 8. Applicant points out that at step 500, the user logs on with name and password (col. 8, lines 4-9). Applicant argues that clearly, the token is stored at the server and the user name/password must be given, matched to the token, and the token is identified with particular files the user will then have access to. Hunnicut teaches that the P-token is stored and matched with the user name at the server.

Applicant's independent claims clearly recite third software executing on the PD (portable device), and a storage location on the PD reserved for the P-token; characterized in that, upon a log-in request signal to the IH from the PD, the IH opens a communication link to the network server, and requests the P-token from the PD. Applicant points out that the P-token must come from the user's requesting device (PD) in order for the log-in to not be required. There is no teaching in Hunnicut of sending the P-token, once generated, back to the PD for storage. Hunnicut teaches away from applicant's limitations as recited in the independent claims.

Applicant believes the art of Hunnicut clearly fails to teach applicant's claim limitations. Applicant respectfully requests the art of Hunnicut be withdrawn. Applicant believes claims 1 and 6 are clearly patentable over the art of Hunnicut. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

In view of the above arguments, and remarks, it is clear that the reference of Hunnicut fails to anticipate or suggest applicant's independent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension

- 7 -

specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Neil Daswani et al.

by



Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457